

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the non-final Office Action dated September 29, 2009 for the above-captioned U.S. Patent Application.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the subject application.

In the outstanding non-final Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC Section 112, first paragraph, as not complying with the written description requirement. Claim 18 also is rejected under 35 USC Section 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, but has clarified claim 18, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsider and withdrawal of these rejections is believed to be warranted. However, should the Examiner object to Applicant's amendment of claim 18, the Examiner is kindly requested to advise Applicant of wording which would be acceptable to the Examiner.

In paragraph 5 of the Action, claims 3 and 8 are then rejected under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. However, in paragraph 6-8, claims 5, 8 and 10 appear to be rejected under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections. In the interest of advancing the prosecution of the subject application, claim 5 is amended to depend from claim 3. Claims 8 and 10 also are clarified. Accordingly, withdrawal of the above rejections is requested.

Regarding the rejections based upon art, claims 1-15 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiki (JP 2003062268) in view of Yokoi (US 4,542,903) and Langlais (US 5,184,956). Dependent claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiki in view of Yokoi, Langlais and Kawai (US 20040229691). Lastly, dependent claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiki in view of Yokoi, Langlais and Hayashida (US 6,409,596).

The foregoing rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Yoshiki relates to a money game and that application necessitates that the game cannot be portable. Hence, a person of ordinary skill in the art, knowing also Yokoi (US4542903), would not have made the Yoshiki device portable without departing from the intended use of Yoshiki device.

Moreover, even if the teachings of Yoshiki were somehow able to be made to be portable (which Applicant does not admit to be the case), the combination would still lack at least the last feature of, for example, Applicant's independent claim 1 as there is no indication of information concerning a display unit application object located only outside a current view of the display unit. The Examiner also recognizes at page 6, lines 9-10 of the Action, that such a combination does not disclose this feature.

The addition of Langlais does not cure the shortcomings of the afore-cited references. In particular, the rear view mirrors 20, 25, 26 of Langlais are referenced in the outstanding Action. However, it is respectfully noted that these mirrors are either "dummy" mirrors which merely cause displaying on the main display corresponding views that one could expect to see in these mirrors while driving a car (e.g. see column 4, lines 48 to 59 for side mirrors and column 4, lines 20 to 47 that describes how an image for rear-view "mirror" 20 is produced with the main image 18 that appears on the main display or screen 16). There is also an alternative embodiment in which these mirrors 20, 25 and 26 are made of additional display screens which present that information instead of the main display, see e.g. column 6, lines 23 to 27. In any case, there is no disclosure or suggestion of Applicant's claimed location of information-indicating light units only outside a current view of the display unit.

Moreover, there is no reason to even supplement the disclosure of Langlais with the last feature of Applicant's claim 1 as, for example, this would make the car driving training less authentic and thus would further prejudice the objectives of

Langlais (simulating the conditions of driving; see column 1, lines 7-10 of Langlais).

It is further respectfully noted that Applicant's independent claim 1 has substantial advantages regarding, for example, mobile use as relatively small displays can be used. For instance, some information can be intentionally left outside the view of the display unit by producing an indication for the user by creating a visual stimulus that can be perceived (see page 3, lines 12 to 14 of Applicant's specification).

In Langlais, for instance, there is no similar need for portability and there is no teaching towards, for example, leaving some information concerning a display unit application object outside the view of the display unit and indicating such an object with information-indicating light units, as in embodiments of Applicant's claimed invention.

It is thus respectfully asserted that that the cited references do not disclose nor suggest the subject matter recited in Applicant's independent claim 1, or in Applicant's remaining independent claims 9, 18 and 19 for corresponding reasons. Nor is there any reason to combine and modify the cited references in an attempt to arrive at the subject matter recited in these claims.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant's independent claims are believed to be patentable in view of the cited art. All remaining dependent claims also are patentable at least in view of their dependency from an allowable independent claim. It also is noted that the addition of secondary references Kawai and Hayashida, which were cited by the Examiner in the rejection of dependent claims 16 and 17, respectively, does not cure the shortcomings of the afore-cited references and does not disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed subject matter.

For completion, it is noted that claims 1 and 2 are clarified to recite "configured to" wording. The preambles of claims 1-8 also are amended for consistency.

Such clarifications are not made for reasons related to patentability and the full range of equivalents should remain intact.

All issues having been addressed, the subject application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections. A Notice of Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions, a call to the undersigned would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Wilkes Beninati 12/28/09
Christine Wilkes Beninati Date

Reg. No.: 37,967

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

12/28/09
Date

J. Droniak
Name of Person Making Deposit